



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Dr. Kohler came to America in 1869, and after serving congregations in Detroit, Chicago, and New York, became in 1903 president of the Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati, where he has also given courses in homiletics, theology, and Hellenistic literature. A biographical sketch appropriately begins the volume, followed by an appreciation of his work as a reformer (by Rabbi David Philipson, of Cincinnati), and a review by Professor Neumark of his *Grundriss einer systematischen Theologie des Judentums*. A bibliography of his publications extends to more than five hundred numbers, not counting separately his many and important contributions to the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, of which he was from the beginning an editor.

The papers contributed to the volume—in English and German, with two short texts in Hebrew—range over a wide variety of subjects. We can only name a few which are most likely to appeal to unprofessional readers. Thus, Israel Abrahams writes on “The Decalogue in Art”; H. G. Enelow has an instructive essay on the “Struggle for Inwardness in Judaism” (*Kawwānā*); Professor Grossmann discusses “Principles of Religious Instruction in Jewish Schools”; Professor Lauterbach takes up again the question of “Sadducees and Pharisees.” There is an article on “Levirate Marriage,” by Mattuck, and one by Samuel Krauss on *Die Ehe zwischen Onkel und Nichte*. Studies of a more technical kind are contributed by Bacher (whose recent death is a great loss to Jewish learning), Goldziher, Poznanski, and Schechter.

The scholar is to be congratulated whom such a company delight to honor.

GEORGE F. MOORE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

EARLY ZOROASTRIANISM. The Hibbert Lectures, Second Series. 1912.
JAMES HOPE MOULTON. Williams & Norgate. 1913. Pp. xx, 468.

Although delivered two years ago, these lectures, the publication of which was delayed for over a year, may be said to be the latest word in the field of Avestan philology, where harvests ripen slowly. It is indeed somewhat remarkable that whereas every year sees the production of one or more volumes on the life and teaching of Buddha, studies in regard to the history and doctrines of Zoroaster should be so sporadic. Yet the importance of Zoroastrianism for Christianity is, if anything, greater than that of Buddhism.

The present volume consists of lectures which take up special sides of Zoroastrianism; it is in no sense a complete history or discussion of the tenets of the faith, such as Professor Jackson's works

published in the *Grundriss* and in *Zoroaster*. One might even say that it is no book for a beginner; yet that would not be quite fair, since the clearness with which Professor Moulton states his several theses makes it possible for any historical scholar to follow him and obtain an intelligent understanding of the problems involved. But in sum, the author is dealing with special problems rather than with an historical whole. His solution of these problems makes his work one of the most fundamental books on Zoroastrianism published in the last two decades.

At the outset Professor Moulton attacks the whole theory of Darmesteter, whose revolutionary views made a sensation twenty years ago. If few scholars now believe, as Darmesteter taught, that Zoroastrianism is really Philoism, the Gathas owing their chief thought to Philo of Alexandria, it is yet well to have the reasons for this disbelief plainly set forth. These are in brief that the conception of the Amshaspand is in itself not identical with Philo's $\lambda\delta\gamma\sigma\theta\epsilon\varsigma\sigma$ and that it is far older, so that the logos could not have been the source; also that the form of the Gathas (especially the metre) is not such that it could have been a late invention. Further, Professor Moulton argues (with Geldner, Jackson, and Bartholomae) that Zoroaster is no mythical person but an historical character, whom the author ascribes to a somewhat earlier period than does Professor Jackson. As to date and place there will always be discussion. Professor Moulton regards 660 B.C. as a "minimum date" for the prophet "and his Gathas," while giving strong reasons for believing that the date may be earlier by some generations. He assigns the Yashts to the later Achaemenian age, and the prose Avesta (in particular the Vendidad) to a period "after Alexander." A prime argument for an earlier Zoroaster lies in the necessity for time sufficient to account for the development between Gathas and Yashts, in which latter the apotheosis of Zoroaster stands opposed to the Gathic view. The most important fact brought out in the following discussion of the date is that the cult of Ahura Mazda (Ormuzd) was probably hereditary in aristocratic circles long before Zoroaster. In regard to the place where the prophet began his work, Professor Moulton believes it to have been in Bactria rather than in the West. He urges that the esoteric teaching of Zoroaster (the doctrine of the Pure Thought, etc.) remained for centuries far from the main stream of its history and spread westwards only when adopted by the Magi.

The most original hypothesis in this volume relates to the Magi themselves. In Professor Moulton's opinion, it was they who in

the Sassanian revival made Parsism what it is today. Ahriman, the "enemy spirit," is a title devised by them; Zoroaster knew only the Druj (Lie). The Magi, in the author's opinion, were an indigenous tribe of shamans who led the non-Aryan population of Media, tried and failed to obtain political power in the revolution of Gaumata, but finally secured religious supremacy. The earliest evidence of their activity as a sacred tribe is in Ezekiel 8 16. They were neither Aryan nor Semitic (note, for example, the method of disposing of the dead). They had characteristics, such as next-of-kin marriages and astrology, which never made headway in Parsism. To them, he thinks, is due the ritual, the composition of the Vendidad; it was they who popularized Zoroastrianism. It is probable that this new theory of the origin and influence of Magism upon Zoroastrianism will not be allowed to pass without protest; but it presents a new view very forcibly and explains ingeniously many otherwise inexplicable facts.

To the student of Christianity the paragraphs on the relation of Babylon and Parsism will be of great interest. Professor Moulton discusses and dismisses as "without any real foundation" the religious influence of Babylon. We think he is quite right in protesting against Meyer's extreme view; but it is also an exaggeration to "dismiss all round the notion that Parsism owes anything material to the religion of the powerful culture on her west." In regard to corresponding concepts in the religion of Israel and Zoroaster, borrowing is admitted in some features of apocalyptic imagery and angelology, but otherwise Professor Moulton is very conservative, one might almost say orthodox: "Ahriman and Satan are only superficially connected." The Incarnation "cannot be discussed" in these lectures; which is a pity. It is true that "accidental coincidence" will account for many strange phenomena; but it is also true that coincidence need not be accidental. Perhaps in this regard, as in that of the relation between Buddhism and Christianity, where proofs fail faith must avail. After all, it is not today a very important matter whether the devil was invented in one country or in another, and other theological questions now more burning than Satan may also become in time merely historical problems. Professor Moulton's own attitude is that of a candid and cool inquirer, who has inquired to good purpose. We do not agree with every conclusion he draws, but we believe that he has made an important contribution to our knowledge of Zoroastrianism.

E. WASHBURN HOPKINS.

YALE UNIVERSITY.